utilized at 31Wa656** is Odocoileus virginianus, and there is evidence that Sylvilagus floridanus was taken infrequently. The fact that these data show an urban diet pattern should come as no great surprise; nevertheless, another pattern emerges when the two sets are contrasted. It is posited that a good deal of stress is reflected by the faunal assemblage in Trench 2 FS2-FS11. This stress is manifested in several ways; the most obvious is the change in the representation of Odocoileus virginianus (white-tail deer). In Trench 2, FS2-FS11, white-tail deer constitutes 31.7% of the assemblage by weight. Evidently this at the expense of beef, representing 13.2% of the assemblage. There also appears to be a heavier reliance on Sus scrofa, representing 17.5% of the faunal assemblage by weight. Gallus gallus (domesticated chicken) seems uncharacteristically under represented in the FS2-11 record. Although it is 5.5% of the faunal assemblage, the fact that Gallus gallus is characterized by a low meat per bone ratio must be taken into account. Also in support of a stress hypothesis is the fact that the majority of the cuts in all of the food species are relatively poor, as evidence by the great proportion of vertebra, rib, mandible, phalange, and lower fore and hind limb fragments (Davidson 1982).

On the other hand, the faunal assemblage in Trench 2 FS1 (which may be associated with the final episode in the Faison residence) reflects a lessor degree of stress and the inventory percentages support this hypothesis. Odocoileus virginianus represents only 4.2% of the assemblage by weight; Bos taurus, 62.5% by weight; Sus scrofa, 6% by weight, and; Gallus gallus, 14.2% by weight. Conspicuously, fish remains are totally absent from both assemblages. This may or may not be due to the following factors: 1) .25" mesh screening failed to retain small fish bone fragments (although, no fish remains were recovered from the flotation samples either); 2) the preservation of fish bone was poor; 3) fish were processed, and their remains deposited elsewhere on the site; 4) fish were processed so as to eliminate bones (fillets), and/or 5) fish was not consumed.

The hypothesis that the faunal assemblage in Trench 2, FS2-FS11 represents an urban diet pattern under stress may be a valid one given the following assumptions: 1) both data sets represent statistically sound samples characterized by the total number and weight of faunal material and by the comparable number of species represented in each; 2) both samples represent the socio-economic circumstances of the time periods in which they were deposited; and, 3) both samples were deposited by agents of similar socio-economic status.

A total of six bone fragments, with a corresponding weight of 27.78g was recovered from Trench 5 (see Table 7-48).